



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,618	09/04/2003	Young-Chan Kim	1293.1851	5000
21171	7590	06/14/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			GOKHALE, SAMEER K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/654,618

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Sameer K. Gokhale

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitation that the "input signal is abnormal", first recited on line 4 of claim 1, must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim and all other claims where the feature appears. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-5, the phrase "input signal is abnormal" first recited on line 4 of claim 1 renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear what is meant by "input signal is abnormal" and the meaning of the phrase is not adequately defined in the specification, in other words, it is not clear what the input signal looks like to be considered as a normal or abnormal input signal.

Regarding claims 6-10, the phrase "input signal is abnormal" first recited on line 3 of claim 6 renders the claims indefinite for the same reasons discussed above.

Regarding claims 11-24, the phrase "input signal is abnormal" first recited on line 4 of claim 11 renders the claims indefinite for the same reasons discussed above.

Regarding claims 25-38, the phrase "input signal is abnormal" first recited on line 3 of claim 25 renders the claims indefinite for the same reasons discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 1, 6, 11, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being by anticipated by Griesshaber et al. (US 4,507,683) (hereafter, "Griesshaber").

Regarding claim 1, Griesshaber teaches a display device (Fig. 2, where the entire system excluding the cameras constitutes a display device) comprising: a signal identifying unit that (Fig. 2, item 100) receives an input signal and identifies the type of the input signal (see col. 3, lines 38-42, where identifying which camera the signal is coming is a form of identifying the type of signal); a signal checking unit that checks whether the identified input signal is abnormal (see col. 3, lines 5-11, where by checking for errors from the camera signals it is checking to see if the signal is abnormal); and a signal changing unit (Fig. 2, item 106, the camera select unit) that switches from the checked input signal to a next input signal to be checked so that the signal checking unit checks whether the next input signal is abnormal, after the signal checking unit checks whether the identified input signal is abnormal (see col. 7 lines 41-61, and see col. 13, lines 39-52, where after checking one camera signal for errors, it must then check a next camera signal for errors).

Regarding claim 6, Griesshaber teaches a method of checking a signal input into a display device (Fig. 2, where the entire system excluding the cameras constitutes a display device), the method comprising: receiving the input signal and identifying a type

of the input signal that is received (see col. 3, lines 38-42, where identifying which camera the signal is coming is a form of identifying the type of signal); checking whether the identified input signal is abnormal (see col. 3, lines 5-11, where by checking for errors from the camera signals it is checking to see if the signal is abnormal); and switching from the checked input signal to a next input signal to be checked so that whether the next input signal is abnormal is checked, after the input signal is checked and found to be abnormal (see col. 3, lines 5-11, and see col. 7 lines 41-61, and see col. 13, lines 39-52, where after checking one camera signal for errors, it must then check a next camera signal for errors, and if the display is showing the status of multiple signals at one time then it must be checking a next input signal even after a previous signal was found to be in error).

Regarding claim 11, Griesshaber teaches a display device (Fig. 2, where the entire system excluding the cameras constitutes a display device) comprising: a signal identifying unit (Fig. 2, item 100) receiving an input signal and identifying the type of received input signal (see col. 3, lines 38-42, where identifying which camera the signal is coming is a form of identifying the type of signal); a signal checking unit (Fig. 2, item 10) checking whether the identified input signal is abnormal (see col. 3, lines 5-11, where by checking for errors from the camera signals it is checking to see if the signal is abnormal); and a signal changing unit (Fig. 2, item 106, the camera select unit) switching from the checked input signal to check a next input signal so that the signal checking unit checks whether the next input signal is abnormal (see col. 3, lines 5-11, and see col. 7 lines 41-61, and see col. 13, lines 39-52, where after checking one

camera signal for errors, it must then check a next camera signal for errors, and if the display is showing the status of multiple signals at one time then it must be checking a next input signal even after a previous signal was found to be in error).

Regarding claim 25, Griesshaber teaches a method of checking a signal input into a display device (Fig. 2, where the entire system excluding the cameras constitutes a display device), the method comprising: receiving an input signal and identifying the type of received input signal (see col. 3, lines 38-42, where identifying which camera the signal is coming is a form of identifying the type of signal); checking whether the received and identified input signal is abnormal (see col. 3, lines 5-11, where by checking for errors from the camera signals it is checking to see if the signal is abnormal); and switching from the checked input signal to a next received and identified input signal to check whether the next received and identified input signal is abnormal (see col. 3, lines 5-11, and see col. 7 lines 41-61, and see col. 13, lines 39-52, where after checking one camera signal for errors, it must then check a next camera signal for errors, and if the display is showing the status of multiple signals at one time then it must be checking a next input signal even after a previous signal was found to be in error).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 24, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that the term "input signal is abnormal" is well understood by one skilled in the art (middle of page 1) in response to the examiner's

drawing objection. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The term “abnormal” when applied to an input video signal is very vague because there are many types of abnormality that may be checked for in a video signal. Additionally, the written description and the claims do not disclose what it means for an input signal to be abnormal such that a drawing would be unnecessary. For example, paragraph 15 of the specification states “the signal checking unit 115 checks whether H-sync and V-sync patterns are not input or one of the input H-sync and V-sync patterns is abnormal, and whether a D-sub cable is connected to check whether the D-sub signal is abnormal.” Here, one reading the specification to find out what is meant by “abnormal” in the claims, only finds continued use of the term “abnormal” without further clarification or an illustration. Therefore, examiner believes that the drawing objection should not be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, the applicant argued that one skilled in the art would know what a normal input signal would look like, and therefore would be able to determine abnormality of the signal (bottom of page 1, top of page 2). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Similar to examiner's response in regards to the drawing objection above, the term “abnormal” when applied to an input video signal is very vague and unclear, and further clarification is not provided by the specification.

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), the applicant argued that Griesshaber fails to teach “a signal changing unit that switches from the checked input signal to a next input signal to be checked so that the signal checking units whether the next input signal is abnormal, after the signal checking unit checks whether the identified input signal is abnormal.” Examiner respectfully disagrees. Griesshaber

recites on col. 13, lines 39-52 "means for successively selecting given cameras of the plurality, each with a respective video signal....means responsive to the means for selecting, for supplying data corresponding to the identification and status of each of the cameras." Further on col. 3, lines 5-8, Greisshaber recites, "The status and diagnostic system of description herein, provides the continuous display of the setup status for each camera, as well as error data generated by the setup..." By successively diagnosing one camera input signal to the a next camera signal, which Greisshaber is clearly doing, it is switching from a checked input signal to a next input signal to determine whether there are errors, which is the same as checking if they are "abnormal". Also, it is clear the Greisshaber is checking one input signal after checking a first signal for abnormality. Applicant has argued that switching from one signal to the next to check for abnormality is made particularly after, and as a result of, the check of the first identified input signal. However, the claim only reads the next input signal is checked "after the signal checking unit checks whether the identified input signal is abnormal". The claim does not require that that the next input signal is checked only if the checked input signal actually finds abnormality. Therefore examiner believes that Greisshaber fairly reads on the claimed limitations.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sameer K. Gokhale whose telephone number is (571) 272-5553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



BIPIN SHALWALA
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SKG
June 9, 2006

Sameer Gokhale
Examiner
Art Unit 2629